PE 172 08 2007 ...

Poplication Control No.: 09/677,493

Filing Date: 10/02/2000

Applicant: George Guang Yang (Previous used name: Guang Yang)

392 Hans Way San Jose, CA 95133 Tel: (408) 729-1282

E-mail: guangyang14@hotmail.com

June 4, 2007

Baoquoc N. To Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Reply to Office Action

Dear Mr. Baoquoc N. To,

Pursuant to 37 CFR § 1.111, this letter is to reply to your "Office Action Summary" and "Detailed Action" mailed to me on May 18, 2007, which reopened prosecution of my patent application in view of my Appeal Brief filed on January 11, 2007 but rejected my Claims 1-7 under 35 USC § 103(a). I do not agree with your rejection. I believe that my patent application Claims 1-7 are significantly different from any prior arts and are patentable under the 35 U.S.C. § 101. I have made minor plural verb and indefinite article corrections to my Claim 1, 6 & 7. Attached are the clean version of amended Claims 1-7 and Notice of Reference.

The followings are my responses and arguments to each item of your "Detailed Action" Items 2-7:

#2. "Response to Arguments"

My invention concludes Claims 1-7 "...particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention." (35 USC § 112, second paragraph). My invention Claims 1-7 are original and patentable under 35 USC § 101.